

PROPOSAL EVALUATION
IRWM Grant Program – Planning Grant, Round 1, FY 2010-2011

Applicant	Yosemite/Sequoia Resource Conservation & Development Council	County	Madera
		Grant Request	\$278,463
		Total Project Cost	\$371,303
Project Title	Madera Region IRWM Plan Update 2011		

Project Description The Madera Region is proposing to update the current IRWMP from the Proposition 50 standards to the Proposition 84 standards. In addition to expanding the list of projects in the Region that are in the original IRWMP, there will be new sections on Climate Change, Disadvantaged Communities, and Governance. The region will also review and update the current sections that were adopted as a plan in 2008.

Evaluation Summary

Scoring Criterion	Score
Work Plan	12
DAC Involvement	8
Schedule	6
Budget	6
Program Preferences	2
Geographic Balance	0
<i>Total Score</i>	<i>34</i>

- **Work Plan** The criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. The work plan lacks detail. There is a listing of sections that will be included in the updated plan; however the approach to preparing each section should be discussed in more detail. It is not clear how/why state wide meetings are necessary for the process of updating the IRWMP. It is unclear if the presentation of the draft IRWM Plan to the RWMG is the only opportunity for the public to make comments?
- **DAC Involvement** In general, the work plan provides tasks for a facilitating and supporting DACs within the IRWM Region, but does not sufficiently detail the process to be used. For example, there is mention of Self Help Enterprises as a member of the RWMG, but no specific information is given about their role.
- **Schedule** The schedule is not entirely consistent or reasonable. For example, task numbers in the schedule do not correspond to task numbers in the budget and work plan. The schedule includes Tasks 1 – 4 and the budget and work plan include Task 1, 2.1 – 2.3. Further, the text states the IRWM update will be an 18 month process, but the schedule is for 16 months. The, schedule’s Task 1 “Manage Collaborative Process and Public Input” ends in April 2011, which is only 8 months into the project. However, from the description and schedule of meetings, this task, which includes project management and administration, should last for the duration of the project (16 or 18 months).
- **Budget** Budgets for most of the plan tasks have detailed cost information, but not all costs appear reasonable. For example, It is not clear why 52 - 73 meetings are required in 16 months. Rate for attendance by agency/government is \$80/hr; stakeholders is \$85/hr – these rates seem very high, especially considering stakeholders are in a DAC and project manager’s rate is \$41.60/hr. 144 hours to complete 4 quarterly reports, a draft and final report seems excessive. Room rates (\$150/night) are not within the State’s allowable rates (\$84/night).
- **Program Preference** Two Program Preferences (Promote Regional Projects/Programs and Practice Integrated Flood Management) are sufficiently discussed in the work plan. The work plan does not convey certainty that the remaining 10 claimed preferences will be addressed in the plan in an adequate fashion.
- **Geographic Balance** Not Applicable